Attachment to Independent Case Review Report
For CDRU # 450 Case File # 95-277201.

Material Examiner: Malone (RO)

Remarks:

No transcript. Guilty plea.

INDEPENDENT CASE REVIEW REPORT

Independent Review conducted by: Steve Robertson

Area(s) of Expertise: Hair and Fiber

Review commenced at: 9:45 AM (Time), 03/13/2001 (Date)

File #: 95-277201

Laboratory #(s): 70224004

Examiner(s) & Symbols

	Reviewed	Not Reviewed		Reviewed	Not Reviewed
RQ	X	☐		☐	☐
	☐	☐		☐	☐
	☐	☐		☐	☐

Materials Reviewed

Trial testimony transcript(s) of:

Testimony Date(s): Pages:

Laboratory Report(s):

Laboratory Number: 70224004 Date: Apr 30, 1987

Laboratory Number: Date:

Laboratory Number: Date:

Examiner Bench Notes of: RQ

Laboratory Number: 70224004

Initials:

CRM - 9854

Was any other material reviewed? X☐ Yes ☐ No

If yes, please identify and/or describe the material: Submitting agency letter (not dated)

Results of Review

File #: 95-277201 Item or Specimen # Reviewed: Q1, Q2, K1

Review of Laboratory Report(s) and Bench Notes:

Note: Numbered comments are required below or on additional pages for any "No" or "Unable to Determine" Responses

1) Did the examiner perform the appropriate tests in a scientifically acceptable manner, based on the methods, protocols, and analytic techniques available **at the time of the original examination(s)**?
☐ Yes ☐ No X ☐ Unable to Determine

2) Are the examination results set forth in the laboratory report(s) supported and adequately documented in the bench notes? ☐ Yes X ☐ No ☐ Unable to Determine

Review of Testimony:

Note: Numbered comments are required below or on additional pages for any "No" or "Unable to Determine" Responses

X☐ Transcript not available.

3) Testimony consistent with the laboratory report(s)? ☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Unable to Determine

4) Testimony consistent with the bench notes? ☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Unable to Determine

5) Testimony within bounds of examiner's expertise? ☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Unable to Determine

Initials: SMR

Comments

(Set forth by above question #, if applicable.
Use "Additional Comments" Sheet, if needed)

File #: 95-277201

#1: With microscopic hair comparison, even with the best notes, there is no way to determine the comparison was performed correctly.

#2: The examination results set forth in the laboratory report are supported by the bench notes, but the documentation is marginally adequate. The notes are not dated or initialed and are in pencil. RQ uses abbreviations to indicate the microscopic characteristics of the hair. These abbreviations are difficult to interpret.

The hair matches were apparently verified by a second hair examiner.

Review completed at: 10:00 AM (Time), 03/13/2001 (Date)

Total time spent conducting review (to nearest 1/4 hour): 0:15 hours

I hereby certify that I conducted this review in an independent, unbiased manner and that the results of my review are fully documented on this report consisting of a total of 3 pages.

Steve Roberts — 03/13/2001

(Signature) (Date)

Initials: SR

95-277201

3-13-01 SAC
9:45 AM

REPORT 70224004 dated 4-30-87
- Cane head hair, forcibly removed, IN Q1, Q2 (vacuum from susp car) same micro as victim

TECH NOTES SAC 70224004 - No Date, initials

EXAM NOTES 70224004 No Date, INITIALS
- use of abbreviations

Q1 - 1 lt b HH frag CO, basal end bkn = K1(V) conf by WL on 4/23/87

Q2 - 1 lt b HH CO F. rem (small foll tag) = K1(V)

NO transcript